

Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9 stand rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,761,327 to Shiga et al. (“Shiga”). The Examiner states that Shiga discloses all of the features of the claimed invention.

Amended claim 1 recites “chamfered portions each comprising a planar surface completely enclosed by three edges.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Shiga. The recited edges that completely enclose the planar surface include a first edge “formed between the planar surface of the chamfered portion and an end surface of said cylindrical body,” a second edge “formed between the planar surface of the chamfered portion and a side surface of said cylindrical body,” and a third edge “formed between the planar surface of the chamfered portion and an outer peripheral surface of said cylindrical body.”

In contrast, Shiga discloses planar surfaces 64 which each include a first edge formed between the planar surface and an end surface 62c, a second edge formed between the planar surface and the slit S, a third edge formed between the planar surface and an outer surface 62a and **a fourth edge** formed between the planar surface and an inner face 62b. Thus, the planar surfaces 64 of Shiga are not completely enclosed by three edges, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the planar surfaces of require the fourth edge to be completely enclosed. Accordingly, Shiga does not include each and every feature of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Shiga. Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to claim 9, the Examiner states that Shiga discloses all of the features of the claimed invention, including that “planar surface being positioned at an acute angle to a longitudinal axis of the cylindrical body and extending over a full cross-sectional area of the cylindrical body.” The Examiner specifically states that in “figure 36, item 64 extends over a full cross-sectional area” of the cylindrical body. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Shiga does not show a chamfered portion with a planar surface “positioned at an acute angle to a longitudinal axis of the cylindrical body and extending over a full cross-sectional area of the cylindrical body” as recited in claim 9. In contrast, inclined guide surface 64 of Shiga is clearly shown as only extending over part of the cross-sectional area of the clamp 62 (alleged cylindrical body). It is clear that end surface 62c extends over the vast majority of the cross-sectional area of clamp 62 of Shiga. Thus, Shiga does not disclose each and every feature of claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over Shiga. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below if the Examiner believes any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment.

Dated: July 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DeJudice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant